

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ANTHONY MORALES-CASTRO	:	CIVIL ACTION
<i>Petitioner</i>	:	
	:	
v.	:	NO. 20-5111
	:	
	:	
BERNADETTE MASON, <i>et al.</i>,	:	
<i>Respondents</i>	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 29th day of January 2021, upon consideration of the *Report and Recommendation* issued on December 30, 2020, by the Honorable Timothy R. Rice, United States Magistrate Judge (the “Magistrate Judge”), [ECF 8], to which no objections were filed by Petitioner, and after a careful and independent review of the record, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The *Report and Recommendation* is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**;¹
2. The petition for writ of *habeas corpus* is **DENIED**, with prejudice;
3. There is no probable cause to issue a certificate of appealability; and
4. The Clerk of Court shall mark this case **CLOSED**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Nitza I. Quiñones Alejandro
NITZA I. QUIÑONES ALEJANDRO
Judge, United States District Court

¹ The R&R recommends that Petitioner’s *habeas corpus* petition be denied because Petitioner failed to provide an accurate address and to name the proper respondent. [ECF 8]. Petitioner has not file any objections and/or response to the R&R, nor has he corrected the deficiencies despite an Order to do so. *See* [ECF 6].

In the absence of any objections, the R&R is reviewed under the “plain error” standard. *See Facyson v. Barnhart*, 2003 WL 22436274, at *2 (E.D. Pa. May 30, 2003). Under this plain error standard of review, the R&R should only be rejected if the magistrate judge commits an error that was “(1) clear or obvious, (2) affect[ed] substantial rights, and (3) seriously affected the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings.” *Leyva v. Williams*, 504 F.3d 357, 363 (3d Cir. 2007) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Here, this Court finds that the Magistrate Judge did not commit any error and, therefore, approves and adopts the R&R in its entirety.